ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 7/12/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED000300	7032	N.A.	

4. AUTHOR(S):
Fricke, Benno G.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Tests, Students, Standards, and Admissions Officers

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
Long Range Planning for Education

7. EDITOR(S):
Traxler, Arthur E.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Univ. of Michigan
ST. Ann Arbor, Michigan
CITY, STATE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
American Council on Education
Washington, D.C.

TELE. EXT
INST/LOC CODE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	80-94	58	15

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES X NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES X NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES X NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL X
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
report

16. INDEXING TERMS (8-12)

examinations G-20	surveys Y-18A			
measurement O-12	students Y-15			
admissions R-07	talent Y-19	personnel I-09		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Report on two sets of data concerned with predictive ability of large group of college admissions officers. Points out inaccuracy of predictions and disagreement among admissions officers on ability of particular student. Also gives results of survey of 330 admissions officers on topics such as use of ability test scores, release of information concerning them, and policies toward students whose ability was much higher than that of the average freshman.

RIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

RIC Form 1

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

IV-2

TESTS, STUDENTS, STANDARDS, AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS

By

BENNO G. FRICKE

Assistant Chief, Evaluation and Examinations Division, and Lecturer in Psychology, University of Michigan

This paper was reprinted as "How Colleges Should Select their Students" in the College Board Review (Spring 1958)

7032

Reprinted from *Long-Range Planning for Education*
published by AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, Washington, D.C., 1958

ED000300

TESTS, STUDENTS, STANDARDS, AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS

BENNO G. FRICKE
Assistant Chief, Evaluation and Examinations Division, and Lecturer in Psychology, University of Michigan

THIS CONFERENCE on "Long-Range Planning for Education" would be incomplete without some serious attention to the quality of the students to be educated and the methods used to select them. One of the most important problems each college has revolves about the question "Who shall be admitted?" In most institutions an admissions officer and his assistants decide whether or not each applicant is qualified for admission. The role of the admissions officer is obviously a crucial one. He, more than anyone else, determines what use is made of tests in admission to college. It is for this reason that this summer I conducted a questionnaire survey of 330 college admissions officers.

But before I give you some specific results from the survey, an interpretation of them, and some suggestions for the future, I would like to share with you six items of background information.

The first item is that research over a period of many years has shown that colleges in this country differ markedly with respect to the quality or ability level of freshmen they enroll. A fairly old and too often forgotten study by Traxler[1] pointed out that in 1937 the range in average IQ in the 323 colleges in the norm group for the American Council on Education Psychological Examination was from an IQ of 94 to an IQ of 123. Certainly it seems reasonable to expect that if the average IQ for each of the 1,800 colleges in the country had been computed there would have been many institutions with averages below 94 and above 123. The ability of freshmen who entered 41 colleges in 1946 was described by Wolfle[2] in his informative book on

[1] Arthur E. Traxler, "What Is a Satisfactory IQ for Admission to College?" *School and Society*, LI (April 6, 1940), 162–64.

[2] Dael Wolfle, *America's Resources of Specialized Talent* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1954), p. 147.

E 3000 300

America's Resources of Specialized Talent. In commenting upon the variability among the colleges in Army General Classification aptitude test scores, he noted that the median AGCT score of freshmen at the lowest-ranking college was 108 and the median at the highest-ranking college was 131. Wolfle indicated that the colleges at either extreme were private, nonsectarian, and were accredited. The data I have collected from admissions officers and from other sources strongly support the view that colleges, both public and independent, differ considerably in the quality of freshmen they admit. While this variability among institutions may disturb some of you, it rather pleases me to think that there is a college with an appropriate ability level for *almost* every high school graduate. I said almost, because we do not, so far as I know, have a college with an average ability level high enough so that the top 3 percent of the high school graduates would be about average and challenged at their level. And it may be true that we do not now have a formal college program appropriate for the bottom 3 percent.

The second bit of information is that students enrolled in *any one college* do not have the same ability; the differences among students are tremendous. For example, the freshmen enrolled in the college having the lowest average score in Wolfle's sample were not uniformly weak. Half of the freshmen made scores between 99 and 117. The bottom quarter were below 99 and the top quarter above 117. Similarly all freshmen in Wolfle's top-ranking college were not uniformly strong. One quarter had scores below 126 and one quarter had scores above 137. This great heterogeneity in ability probably means that, if each student is to do satisfactory work in his institution, most of the bottom quarter will have to work much harder than the average student and most of the top quarter need not exert themselves in order to perform satisfactorily.

A third item of information we should be aware of is that a large number of freshmen who enter college with the intention of graduating do not graduate. The percentage of freshmen who graduate is usually placed somewhere around 50. This high attrition rate represents a great loss in human resources.

A fourth item is that academic aptitude test scores and other intellectual or achievement variables such as average high school grade or high school percentile rank correlate substantially with academic success in college. Literally thousands of prediction studies have been

done with these variables. One thing we probably do not need is another study which correlates these standard predictors with college success. The extent of the relationship has remained essentially the same for all colleges for the past thirty-five to fifty years. Each year the correlation between entrance or orientation test scores and achievement in almost every college tends to be about .45. The correlation between high school achievement and college achievement tends to be somewhat higher, about .55. When a combination of test scores and high school achievement is correlated with college achievement, the correlation tends to be about .64.

The relationships which have been established permit us to indicate that those with low scores are likely to do unsatisfactory work and those with high scores are likely to do satisfactory or better work. A concrete way of seeing the significance of the relationship is to examine the college grades of those who are at the extremes in ability. In general, those who rank in the bottom 5 percent of their freshman class have about one chance in eleven of doing as well as or better than the average student. Those who rank in the top 5 percent of their class in ability have about ten chances in eleven of doing as well as or better than the average student.

A fifth point is that many variables and factors other than tested aptitude and high school performance have been investigated as possible predictors of college success, but nothing of much practical importance has been uncovered. While it is true that studies usually find that the children of professional parents perform better in college than children of semiskilled parents, that students who were leaders in high school perform better in college than students who were not leaders in high school, and that students who were given favorable forecasts by school principals perform better in college than students who were given less favorable forecasts by school principals, and so on, this does not provide much, if any, new valid information. Almost always the two student groups differ in tested aptitude and high school achievement. If this difference is taken into account, or controlled, then almost never do the two groups perform differently in college. For example, if you selected one group of students who were children of professional parents and matched them according to tested aptitude and high school achievement with another group of students who were children of semiskilled parents, you would not find a difference in their college performance.

One of the variables which many attempts have been made to assess is personality. While it seems reasonable to believe that many students fail or succeed in college largely because of their personality, the important point is that at the present time we cannot identify them by techniques currently available, and this definitely includes the interview.

A sixth and final point is that research in a variety of areas shows that, in general, more accurate assessments and predictions are made by a formula or actuarial table than by an expert in human behavior. Meehl in a book entitled *Clinical Versus Statistical Prediction: A Theoretical Analysis and a Review of the Evidence* shows that the human judge or clinician is not very reliable and that he tends to overvalue information with little or no validity, with the net result of relatively inaccurate assessments.[3] Studies by Kelly and Fiske,[4] Melton,[5] Sarbin,[6] and others disclose that more accurate academic predictions can be made by a mechanical combination of test scores and previous academic record than by assessment psychologists who are trained in evaluating people. It is possible, though improbable, that admissions officers are atypical with respect to their predictive ability. Perhaps they can integrate all the information that they collect and make surprisingly accurate assessments. In an article published a little more than a year ago in *College and University: Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers*,[7] I suggested that each admissions officer test himself and see if his appraisal of an applicant's academic promise was superior to that revealed by a mechanical combination of an aptitude test and high school achievement. As far as I know no admissions officer has done this.

I would like now to review briefly some data on the predictive ability of admissions officers. While I do not know how accurately

[3] Paul E. Meehl, *Clinical Versus Statistical Prediction* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954).

[4] E. Lowell Kelly and Donald W. Fiske, *The Prediction of Performance in Clinical Psychology* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1951).

[5] Richard S. Melton, "A Comparison of Clinical and Actuarial Methods of Prediction with an Assessment of the Relative Accuracy of Different Clinicians" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1952).

[6] Theodore R. Sarbin, "A Contribution to the Study of Actuarial and Individual Methods of Prediction," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLVIII (1942), 593–602.

[7] Benno G. Fricke, "Prediction, Selection, Mortality, and Quality Control," *College and University*, XXXII (1956), 34–52.

individual admissions officers can predict student performance, I do have two sets of data concerned with the predictive ability of a substantial *group* of college admissions officers. In general, an appraisal by two judges is more reliable and valid than an appraisal by one, and an appraisal by three is better than an appraisal by two, and so on.

The first set of data was collected by Henry S. Dyer and reported in *College Admissions,* Volume 1.[5] Eighty of the nation's leading admissions officers who met at Harriman, New York, in 1953 for four days were asked to evaluate twelve applicant case histories and predict each one's performance in college. Dyer indicated that the admissions officers were presented with "all of the available data on twelve admissions cases taken from college files." The differential forecasts were to be in one of four categories: Superior, Average, Inferior, and Flunk-out. Table 1 shows the predictions of the admissions officers and the actual performance of the students.

At least two points merit comment. First, and perhaps most important, the admissions officers *do not agree with each other.* The implications of this are overwhelming. It suggests that an institution practicing "selective admissions" may enroll one group of students from a specific set of applicants if it has Mr. X as its admissions officer, but may enroll a different group of students from the same set of applicants if it happens to have Mr. Y as its admissions officer. It is possible, though unlikely, that the students selected by Messrs. X and Y would be equal in quality. The admissions officer's personality, needs, values, biases, and so on undoubtedly determine consciously or unconsciously the applicants he thinks will succeed or are qualified for admission. Mr. X may tend to favor applicants who are extrovertive, or submissive, or regular church-goers, or "from a good upper-class home," or academic overachievers, or physically robust, or other things.

Mr. Y may give preference to applicants who attended large public high schools, or made a special effort to be interviewed on campus, or applied early for admission, or submitted a neatly prepared application for admission, or value the arts and humanities most highly, or are judged to be attractive by the school principal or headmaster, or worked fifteen hours a week during high school, or did or were something else. It is not that these criteria are completely lacking in valid-

[5] Dyer, "The Evaluation of Case Histories" in *College Admissions,* Vol. 1 (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1954).

ity; but the same ones are not used by all admissions officers, and sometimes the same information operates in different directions.

Case 1 turned out to be average, but twenty-four admissions officers thought he would "flunk out." If you were Case 1 and were, by chance, unfortunate enough to have had one of the twenty-four evaluate your application, you would have been refused admission. And it is probable that you would have been refused by the forty-three admissions officers who judged you to be one who is likely to be "inferior."

TABLE 1

PREDICTION OF STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN COLLEGE BY 80 ADMISSIONS OFFICERS*

Student	Superior	Average	Inferior	Flunk-Out	Total
Case 1.....	0	√/13	43	24	80
Case 2.....	√/3	37	28	12	80
Case 3.....	√/0	8	36	36	80
Case 4.....	9	√/49	18	4	80
Case 5.....	39	31	0	√/4	74
Case 6.....	9	√/65	5	1	80
Case 7.....	√/67	12	0	1	80
Case 8.....	43	32	3	√/2	80
Case 9.....	17	51	10	√/2	80
Case 10.....	43	37	0	√/0	80
Case 11.....	0	√/11	25	44	80
Case 12.....	√/80	0	0	0	80
Total.....	310	346	168	130	954

√/ = actual performance position of the student.
* These data were reported by Henry S. Dyer, "The Evaluation of Case Histories" in *College Admissions*, Vol. 1 (College Entrance Examination Board, 1954).

The second thing deserving comment is the inaccuracy of the predictions. Only thirteen of the eighty correctly predicted Case 1's performance. Only a small minority of all predictions (as shown in Table 1) were right. Thank goodness for Case 12!

It is improbable that the admissions officers would do so poorly on a random sample of, say, 100 cases. Dyer did not say how the twelve cases were selected, but on the basis of this and other evidence it can be said they were as a group rather unpredictable.

Table 2 shows the relative accuracy of the pooled judgment of the eighty admissions officers and a statistical formula using only one test score, the College Board's Scholastic Aptitude Test–Verbal score. It is to be noted that the Inferior and Flunk-out categories have been combined into one category labeled Below Average, this is placed in

TABLE 2

RELATIVE ACCURACY OF PREDICTION OF STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN COLLEGE BY 80 ADMISSIONS OFFICERS AND BY SAT-VERBAL SCORES, THREE CATEGORIES

Student	A AA = 1 Above Average	B A = 2 Average	C BA = 3 Below Average	D Actual Performance of Student	E Preferred Prediction by Admissions Officers	F Error of Admissions Officers' Prediction	G Student SAT-V Score	H College Average SAT-V Score	I SAT-V Prediction (±100)	J Error of SAT-V Prediction
Case 1	0	√/13	67	A: 2	BA: 3	1	494	575	−81: A: 2	0
Case 2	√/ 3	37	40	AA: 1	BA: 3	2	347	500	−153: BA: 3	2
Case 3	√/ 0	8	72	AA: 1	BA: 3	2	420	600	−180: BA: 3	2
Case 4	9	√/49	22	A: 2	A: 2	0	419	580	−161: BA: 3	1
Case 5	39	31	4	BA: 3	AA: 1	−2	678	525	153: AA: 1	−2
Case 6	9	√/65	6	A: 2	A: 2	0	563	580	−17: A: 2	0
Case 7	√/67	12	1	AA: 1	AA: 1	0	525	475	50: A: 2	1
Case 8	43	32	√/ 5	BA: 3	AA: 1	−2	705	600	105: AA: 1	−2
Case 9	17	51	√/12	BA: 3	A: 2	−1	513	560	−47: A: 2	−1
Case 10	43	37	√/ 0	BA: 3	AA: 1	−2	582	580	02: A: 2	−1
Case 11	0	√/11	69	A: 2	BA: 3	1	486	550	−64: A: 2	0
Case 12	√/80	0	0	AA: 1	AA: 1	0	743	620	123: AA: 1	0
Total	310	346	298			13				12

column C; Below Average (BA) is given a weight or rank of 3. The former Superior category has been labeled Above Average (AA) and is given a weight of 1. The Average category is given a weight of 2. Column D shows the actual performance of each student, and column E shows the preferred prediction by the eighty admissions officers. Column F shows the error of the admissions officers: this is the discrepancy between the values in columns C and D. Column G shows each student's SAT–Verbal score and column H shows the average SAT–Verbal score of students enrolled in the college attended by each student.

The formula used mechanically to evaluate each applicant and predict his college performance was as follows. If the applicant's SAT–Verbal score was within 100 points of his college's average SAT–Verbal score, Average performance would be predicted for him. But if his score was more than 100 above the college's average then Above Average was predicted; and if his score was more than 100 below the college's average, then Below Average was predicted. These predictions, it should be emphasized, can be made by a clerk, just as a clerk determines whether a graduating senior has met all the graduation requirements.

The predictions based only on the SAT–Verbal scores are shown in column I. Column J shows the errors made by the formula predictions using the SAT.

At the bottom of columns F and J we have cumulated the errors made by the admissions officers, 13, and the SAT–V, 12. This difference of one is not statistically significant, but it is interesting to see that differential predictions made by eighty admissions officers are not superior to those made mechanically by one test. The admissions officers had the test score as well as a great deal of additional information, the net effect of which was not more accurate predictions. Perhaps more important, the typical admissions officer working by himself or with a few assistants is unlikely to do nearly as well as the pooled judgment of these eighty admissions officers.

If you will look at the predictions in columns E and I, you see that there is a high correlation between the predictions of the admissions officers and the SAT–Verbal scores. The predictions were identical for seven of the twelve cases, and differed by only one category for the remaining five cases. Almost always when comparisons between the

human evaluator and the mechanical formula are made, it is found that there is a close relationship between the two, but that when the human evaluator departs from the mechanical formula he is more often wrong than right. This may be surprising and disappointing, but it is true, and our behavior should be governed accordingly.

The only other set of data I have been able to find which I could use to compare the assessment ability of admissions officers with that of a formula was collected and reported by Rixford K. Snyder.[9] Ten admissions committees, each composed of seven college admissions officers and three secondary school representatives, were formed from those who attended the fourth admissions colloquium at Harriman, New York, in 1956. Without going into the details of the "Exercise in Assessment," as it was called, it can be said that the essential task was to rank twenty applicants—ten men and ten women—according to their admissibility. The two bottom-ranking students for each sex were denied admission by all ten admissions committees. The remainder were admitted by one or more committees and the two top-ranking students for each sex were unanimously judged to be the strongest.

Table 3 shows how the ten men ranked according to the judgments made by the ten admissions committees and how they ranked according to a mechanical combination of a test of scholastic aptitude and a measure of relative high school achievement. The tested aptitude for each man was obtained by adding the Verbal and Mathematical scores of the SAT. The measure of high school achievement for each man was obtained by computing the percentage of his high school graduating class he surpassed; this is his high school percentile rank (HSPR). The total SAT scores and HSPR's were ranked separately and added to give each equal weight before the final ranking under column I was obtained.

The errors made by the committees are indicated in column C and the errors by the combination of SAT and HSPR are indicated in column J. The total error for the committees is 28; for the mechanical formula it is 24.

Table 4 contains similar material for the ten women. Here the errors are 29 and 28, respectively. Since the results are consistent with those discussed earlier, further comment is unnecessary.

Now for some results from the questionnaire survey of the 330

[9] Snyder, "An Exercise in Assessment" in *College Admissions*, Vol. 4 (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1957).

TABLE 3

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEES' JUDGMENTS VERSUS SAT AND HSPR ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO COLLEGE PERFORMANCE OF 10 MEN

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Student	Rank by Admissions Committee	Rank by Performance in College	Errors by Committee	SAT V+M Score	Rank on SAT	HSPR*	Rank on HSPR	Rank on SAT+Rank on HSPR	Rank by SAT+HSPR	Errors by SAT+HSPR
Gap	1	1	0	1506	1	98	1.5	2.5	1	0
Fan	2	2	0	1158	5	98	1.5	6.5	2	0
Diz	3	5	2	1128	6	93	4	10	4.5	.5
Art	4	10	6	1381	2	80	7	9	3	7
Bat	5	9	4	1296	3	51	10	13	8	1
Haw	6	8	2	1255	4	89	6	10	4.5	3.5
Elk	7	3	4	1024	7	90	5	12	6.5	3.5
Ian	8	4	4	910	9	97	3	12	6.5	2.5
Cot	9.5	6	3.5	978	8	77	8	16	9	3
Jet	9.5	7	2.5	642	10	54	9	19	10	3
Total	.....	.....	28	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	24

* These HSPR's indicate the percentage of the entire high school graduating class who ranked below each student (for example, a student who was first in a class of ten would have an HSPR of 90 since 90 percent of the class of which he was a part ranked below him).

TABLE 4

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEES' JUDGMENTS VERSUS SAT AND HSPR ASSESSMENTS IN RELATION TO COLLEGE PERFORMANCE OF 10 WOMEN

Student	A Rank by Admissions Committee	B Rank by Performance in College	C Errors by Committee	D SAT V+M Score	E Rank on SAT	F HSPR	G Rank on HSPR	H Rank on SAT+Rank on HSPR	I Rank by SAT+HSPR	J Errors by SAT+HSPR
Ionia	1	5	4	1404	1	82	7	8	3	2
Grace	2	1	1	1265	3	94	2	5	1.5	.5
Diana	3	9	6	1288	2	90	3	5	1.5	7.5
Cleo	4	3	1	1081	6	89	4.5	10.5	5.5	2.5
Bertha	5.5	8	2.5	1111	4.5	85	6	10.5	5.5	2.5
Hepzibah	5.5	4	1.5	1111	4.5	—	4.5	9	4	0
Fanny	7	2	5	931	9	66	10	19	10	8
Jeannie	8	10	2	1054	7	73	8	15	8	2
Alice	9.5	6	3.5	780	10	99	1	11	7	1
Ella	9.5	7	2.5	947	8	71	9	17	9	2
Total	.....	.....	29	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	28

college admissions officers. About 94 percent of the 330 admissions officers answered the questions upon which the following material is based. According to the admissions officers, one third of the institutions now use, for admissions purposes, ability test scores for practically all (90 percent or more) of their freshman applicants. Over four fifths of the private institutions use tests in evaluating applicants, but only one fourth of the major state-supported institutions use them. Only about one third of the institutions *who do not now* use tests think it is likely that in about *five years* they will request applicants to present ability test scores; almost half of the admissions officers said they did not know whether their institution would require ability test scores for admission, and the remainder, almost one fifth, said their institution would not be using tests for admission.

Practically every institution which does not require an ability test for admission administers one to new freshmen during an orientation period or shortly after they are enrolled. When the admissions officers were asked, "Approximately what relationship (correlation coefficient) is usually found at your institution between tested ability and freshman grade-point average?", over one half of them did not know. The average correlation coefficient reported was about .50. It was surprising to see that the coefficients reported by the admissions officers of the Ivy League schools and Big Seven women's colleges were essentially the same as those reported by the junior colleges.

While about nine tenths of the admissions officers said their institution had information on the tested ability and high school performance of enrolled students, less than half of them said they knew the approximate mean and standard deviation of the scores of their freshmen.

About half of the admissions officers said they and their institution would be willing to release information on the quality of their freshmen to other admissions officers throughout the country. Only about one tenth of the admissions officers who had the information said they would not release it.

I asked the admissions officers, "If a freshman applicant were to ask you for the mean ability test score and HSPR (or average high school grade) of freshmen enrolled at your institution, and you had the information, would you give it to him?" About one third answered "Yes," one quarter answered "No," about one third answered "Don't know," and the remainder, less than one tenth, did not answer the

question. Only about one fifth of the institutions now supply freshman applicants information on the tested ability and/or high school performance of enrolled freshmen.

Although some admissions officers could not believe I was serious, I asked them, "In general do you think it would be wise for institutions to discourage or refuse freshman applicants whose tested ability and past performance is considerably *above* the average freshman in the institution?" A little less than one tenth answered "Yes," about four fifths answered "No," and one seventh indicated they were "Undecided."

When asked, "*Have you ever discouraged or refused admission* to an applicant because his tested ability and/or past performance was too much *higher* than the average freshman in your institution?" only about 3 percent said "Yes."

Percentages ranged from 0 to 50 in answer to the question, "Approximately what percentage of the freshmen who are accepted for admission by your institution do you personally feel are *not sufficiently qualified* to do satisfactory college work?" However, the average percentage was about 6 percent.

A little more than half the admissions officers said they would refuse admission or would be likely to refuse admission to applicants who rank below a certain score on an aptitude test or an HSPR, or on a combination of them. A little less than half would not refuse them.

Time does not permit quoting the many interesting comments made by the admissions officers on their questionnaires and in their letters. But following are a few which reflect rather typical problems of points of view. The admissions officer of a junior college, in explaining why he had indicated that from 6 to 10 percent of those accepted were insufficiently qualified to do satisfactory college work, said, "As a public junior college we are obliged to admit any student making application. A number of them are inadequately trained or do not have the mental capacity to do college work." The admissions officer of one of the major institutes of technology indicated he felt 0 percent were insufficiently qualified and that "In general, failures are due to emotional or motivational problems." It is of special significance that the correlation between tested ability and grade-point average he reported for his institution was .55–.64. The admissions officer of a woman's college who did not know the correlation between test scores

and college achievement in his college felt only from 1 to 5 percent were insufficiently qualified. He said, "We allow a handful of students —usually with alumni connections—to gamble on succeeding in college in the face of the prospects of failure indicated by the College Entrance Examination Board tests."

What does the questionnaire data and the rest of the information I have presented all add up to? My answer, in one sentence is: *many freshmen will continue to be enrolled in institutions where they are unlikely to be successful or challenged and productive.* The major problem I see is heterogeneity of ability. This diversity among students makes it possible to predict fairly well that those who have the low scores will do unacceptable work, despite their effort and emotional suffering, and that those who have the high scores will do acceptable work without being challenged really to put forth their best effort. These students do not have an equal opportunity for success. As I pointed out in the article addressed to the nation's admissions officers, high predictive correlation coefficients portray inequalities of opportunity for success which can be reduced or eliminated. Some admissions officers tell me that most of their applicants are qualified and that they turn down two qualified ones for each one they accept. The high coefficients they report, however, make me doubt that all those who were admitted were really qualified. That is, failure for some of them can be predicted fairly accurately.

In a time when so much stress is being placed on optimum use of our human resources, improved methods for determining who is qualified for admission to college X should be used. The phrase "qualified for college" as commonly used lacks meaning. An applicant may be qualified for one college but not for another, and he may be overqualified for still another. In my opinion a student is qualified for a college if the achievement you predict for him is at the class *average;* if his predicted achievement is *below average* he is not qualified, and similarly if his predicted achievement is *above average* he is overqualified (or too able). If he is predicted to be *below average* or *above average* his needs can probably best be met by some other institution. One thing that disturbs me about the plans for numerous junior and community colleges is that they will tend to enroll students who are very heterogeneous with respect to ability. Many able students will find these colleges so convenient that they may miss a more challenging opportunity a little farther away.

The formula which I believe gives the best assessment of a student's qualification for college I have described elsewhere in detail. It is obtained by giving one third of the weight to tested aptitude and two thirds of the weight to rank in the high school graduating class. Very briefly the *college qualification rank* (CQR) of each applicant would be obtained by multiplying his HSPR by two and adding this to his percentile rank on a scholastic aptitude test (where norms are established on all high school graduating seniors); this sum divided by three would be the applicant's *college qualification rank*. Applicants with CQR's much below or above each institution's average CQR should not be admitted.

Although I, personally, would like to see each college publicly and explicitly state what students it will admit, and will not admit by use of the CQR, my correspondence and conversations with admissions officers suggest that many institutions are unlikely to do this in the immediate future. But they might go part of the way. For example, a few of the major independent colleges in the country might state that they will admit all applicants who have a CQR of 98 or higher (that is, those who are in the top 3 percent), that they will not admit anyone with a CQR less that 90, and that they would be willing to consider applicants with CQR's between 90 and 97. The major state university in each state might indicate that it will accept all applicants whose CQR is 90 or higher, that it will not accept applicants whose CQR is below 80, and that it will consider applicants whose CQR is between 80 and 89. Certain of the junior or community colleges might state that they will accept applicants with a CQR between 30 and 60, not accept applicants whose CQR is below 20 or above 70, but that they will consider the remainder. In other words I believe that every college in the country, private and public, should practice selective admission in order to fulfill an important role in higher education. I think it is important for society and each individual that students have an opportunity for success at their ability level. Not all students are capable of "sputnik level" achievements and the progress of those who are should not be retarded by those who can be educated to do other things satisfactorily and with satisfaction.